



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/222,833	12/30/1998	TADASHI OHASHI	1341.1025/JD	2628

21171 7590 06/17/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

27

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/222,833

Applicant(s)

OHASHI, TADASHI

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4 and 7-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4 and 7-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 3/29/04 to the application filed on 12/30/98, priority 7/24/98.
2. Claims 2-3, 5-6 are canceled.
3. Claims 1, 4, 7-9 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7-9 are independent claims.

Priority

4. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1, 7-9 are objected to because of the following informalities: the word "mater" within "to which the job electronic multimedia object belongs does not coincide with job information of a corresponding organization of the enterprise in the mater enterprise job information" (claim 1, lines 27-29; claim 7, lines 26-28; claim 8, lines 27-29; claim 9, lines 25-26) is a typographical error. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1, 4, 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding independent claim 1, it is unclear what "does not coincide with job information of a corresponding organization of the enterprise in the master enterprise job information" (line 28). Please explain.

Claims 7-9 are also rejected under the same issue.

Dependent claim 4 is rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of its base claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 7-9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hager et al. (US Pat No. 5,247,661, 9/21/93) in view of Shakib et al. (US Pat No. 5,787,262, 7/28/98, filed 6/26/96).

Regarding independent claim 1, Hager discloses:

- storing a plurality types of enterprise attribute information to manage distribution targets of each electronic multimedia object for the jobs, the enterprise attribute information comprise as information on organizations of the enterprise information on at least a corporate organization code and a corporate

Art Unit: 2178

organization name (col 2, lines 20-39, figure 4B: the code and description, which are attribute information equivalent to the organization code and the organization name *stored in the functional areas*, are used to *determine a preselected group of recipients in distributing an electronic document*; the electronic documents include electronic mails (col 1, lines 35-52) that may have text and graphics, thus the electronic documents are considered as multimedia documents or multimedia objects)

- storing said electronic multimedia objects that include the plurality types of enterprise attribute information (col 3, lines 16-30 and col 4, lines 16-37: storage device to store documents for distribution which are invention disclosure documents; col 7, line 47 to col 8, line 27, figure 4B: the multimedia document has the plurality types of enterprise attribute information such as the creator name and employee number in accordance with the functional areas including the department code and department name)
- storing job information of the organizations of the enterprise (col 7, line 47 to col 8, line 27 and figure 4B: the information of the organization of the enterprise such as the department/division data, the functional areas, the organization data, and the data of individuals within the organization is included in the employee file)
- error checking of document data before transmitting (figure 2, #64, #66)

Hager does not disclose:

- determining, according to a predetermined cycle, for each job electronic multimedia object stored in the electronic multimedia object storage section,

Art Unit: 2178

whether the plurality types of enterprise attribute information included in the job electronic multimedia object and/or an enterprise organization target job to which the job electronic multimedia object belongs conflicts with the master enterprise attribute information and/or conflicts with the master enterprise job information, respectively, if a combination of the at least corporate organization code and the at least corporate organization name of the master enterprise attribute information does not coincide with the enterprise attribute information included in the job electronic multimedia object and/or the enterprise organization target job to which the job electronic multimedia object belongs does not coincide with job information of a corresponding organization of the enterprise in the master enterprise job information

- rewriting any of the attribute information included in the document when said determination section determined that the attribute information conflicts with the master attribute information

Shakib discloses comparing the received properties to local properties to *check the conflict* between the received and local properties of the distributed data objects (figure 6, #148 and abstract) and resolving the conflict by *replacing the received properties with the latest version* (col 24, line 61 to col 25, line 57; figure 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Shakib into Hager for the following reason. Shakib discloses a method for distributed conflict resolution by *checking the conflict* between the received properties and the local properties of the data object and by *replacing the*

properties with the latest version providing the advantage to apply to Hager for *determining* whether the functional areas data included in the document profile conflicts with the functional areas including the organization code and organization name for the creator of the document included in the employee file as well as using the functional areas data for determining a preselected list of recipients in distributing the document and rewriting the data if a conflict is found.

Independent claim 7 is for a computer-readable medium for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 8 is for a computer system for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 9 is for a system for managing electronic documents of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claim 4 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hager in view of Shakib as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Domen et al. (US Pat No. 5,504,676, 4/2/96, filed 5/26/94).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Shakib discloses *sending a conflict notification to notify the changes* of the properties of the data object (figure 6, #160; col 26, lines 40-52).

However, Hager and Shakib do not disclose *outputting an electronic mail*, when the document is rewritten, *to notify changing* of an attribute information in the document to each department identified by the attribute information included in the rewritten document.

Domen discloses *using an electronic email to notify things to other work station* (col 2, lines 31-34, command is issued from a terminal ... the prepared form may be transmitted to other work station by an electronic mail).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Domen into Hager and Shakib since Domen has the advantage of using email in notifying things to other work station providing the capability of enhancing the sending of the conflict notification via messages as in Shakib.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 3/29/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Hager and Shakib do not disclose or suggest two types of master databases to manage distribution target related attribute information included in job electronic multimedia objects since (Remarks, page 9).

Examiner does not agree completely.

Hager does disclose storing a plurality types of enterprise attribute information to manage distribution targets of each electronic multimedia object for the jobs, the

Art Unit: 2178

enterprise attribute information comprise as information on organizations of the enterprise information on at least a corporate organization code and corporate organization name (col 2, lines 20-39, figure 4B: the code and description, which are attribute information equivalent to the organization code and the organization name *stored in the functional areas*, are stored and used to determine a preselected group of recipients in distributing an electronic document) and storing job information of the organizations of the enterprise (col 7, line 47 to col 8, line 27 and figure 4B: the information of the organization of the enterprise such as the department/division data, the functional areas, the organization data, and the data of individuals within the organization is included in the employee file).

Applicants argue that Hager and Shakib do not disclose or suggest the conflict checking against two master attribute databases since Hager only checks to determine if all the required data for a complete invention disclosure form has been entered, but does not provide any motivation to conflict check the input document profile data with the master profile (Remarks, page 11).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Hager discloses the master profile including the department/division data, the organization data, and the functional areas data (col 7, line 47 to col 8, line 27). Hager further discloses a document profile with functional area data of the electronic document (col 2, lines 20-39; col 4, lines 38-64).

Art Unit: 2178

Shakib discloses checking the conflict between the received properties and the local properties of the data object and rewrite data if conflict is found (figure 6). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Shakib into Hager for checking conflict of the document profile data with the master profile since received properties of the data object in Shakib are equivalent to the master profile of the data object in Hager, the local properties of the data object in Shakib are equivalent to the document profile of the data object in Hager. The conflict checking of Shakib between the two properties, therefore, can be applied for checking the conflict between the two profiles including data of the document in Hager, and for rewriting data if the conflict is found.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Shaw et al. (US Pat No. 5,754,766, 5/19/98, filed 8/14/95).

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2178

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tabuchi et al. (US Pat No. 6,332,160 B1, 12/18/01, 6/25/98).

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Clh
6/10/04



STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER